



AFI 3FD

S/N 10/687,291

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Michael J. Branson, et al. Examiner: Haoshian Shih
Serial No.: 10/687,291 Group Art Unit: 2173
Filed: October 16, 2003 Confirmation Number: 8981
Title: Moving Data Between Docket: ROC920030263US1
 Views

APPEAL BRIEF
TO THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir: —

This brief is presented in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on July 26, 2007, from the Final Rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-20 of the above-identified application, as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on April 26, 2007.

Please charge \$500.00 to Deposit Account 09-0465 to cover the fee for filing an appeal brief. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account 09-0465. Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 1-6 and 8-20.

10/02/2007 EAYALEW1 00000023 090465 10687291

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 2

Docket: ROC920030263US1

Table of Contents

1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
3. STATUS OF CLAIMS	5
4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	6
5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER	7
6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	12
7. ARGUMENT	13
8. CLAIMS APPENDIX	20
9. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	24
10. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	25

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al. Page 3
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003 Docket: ROC920030263US1
Title: Moving Data Between Views

1. Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest, in addition to the inventors, Michael J. Branson, George F. DeStefano, Gregory R. Hintermeister, and Andrew J. Streit, is the assignee, International Business Machines Corporation, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of New York, and having an office and place of business at New Orchard Road, Armonk, New York 10504.

Appellant:	Michael J. Branson, et al.	Page 4
Serial No.:	10/687,291	
Filed:	October 16, 2003	Docket: ROC920030263US1
Title:	Moving Data Between Views	

2. Related Appeals and Interferences

There are no other prior or pending appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings, which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision.

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 5

Docket: ROC920030263US1

3. Status of Claims

On July 26, 2007, Appellant appealed from the final rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-20 made in the Final Office Action dated April 26, 2007. Finally rejected claims 1-6 and 8-20 on appeal are set forth in the Claims Appendix. Claim 7 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Appellant:	Michael J. Branson, et al.	Page 6
Serial No.:	10/687,291	
Filed:	October 16, 2003	Docket: ROC920030263US1
Title:	Moving Data Between Views	

4. Status of Amendments

Subsequent to the Final Office Action, on June 26, 2007, appellant filed an amendment under 37 CFR 1.116. In an Advisory Action dated July 10, 2007, the Supervisory Patent Examiner indicated that the amendment will not be entered.

5. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

As described at page 2, last paragraph, lines 23-29 of appellant's specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 210, 215, and 220, in Fig. 4, elements 410, 415, 420, 422, 425, 430, 435, 440, and 445, a method, apparatus, system, and signal-bearing medium are provided that in an embodiment present a main view and at least one peek view of data. When the user selects to move the data from the main view to the peek view, a subset of data objects in the main view is selected based on an importance of the data objects and optionally based on the size of the peek view. The subset is copied to the peek view, and the peek view is dynamically updated when the data objects are updated.

With reference to claim 1, an embodiment of the invention comprises a method, which is described, for example, at page 2, third full paragraph, line 23 of the specification and in Fig. 4, elements 410, 415, 420, 422, 425, 430, 435, 440, and 445; wherein the method comprises:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects based on a respective importance of each of the first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view, which is described, for example, at page 9, last full paragraph (lines 25-27) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, element 205, in Fig. 3, elements 130 and 326, and in Fig. 4, element 415;

copying the subset to a peek view, which is described, for example, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 9-11) of the specification and in Fig. 4, element 420; and

replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 18-23), page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, page 14, first full paragraph (lines 7-12) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 215, and 220, and in Fig. 4, elements 435 and 445.

With reference to claim 3, in an embodiment, the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a size of the peek view, which is described, for example, at page

12, first full paragraph (lines 4-7) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, and in Fig. 4, element 415.

With reference to claim 6, an embodiment of the invention comprises an apparatus, which is described, for example, at page 2, last full paragraph (line 23) of the specification, at page 5, first, second, and third full paragraphs (lines 10-29) of the specification, and in Fig. 1, elements 100, 102, 115, 110, 126, 128, and 130. The apparatus of claim 6 comprises:

means for receiving a first plurality of data objects and a plurality of respective importance tags, which is described, for example, at page 12, first full paragraph, lines 12-14 of the specification, page 14, first partial paragraph (lines 1-6) of the specification, at Fig. 1, elements 128 and 130, at Fig. 2, element 205, at Fig. 3, element 130, and at Fig. 4, elements 405, 435, 440, and 445;

means for selecting a subset of the first plurality of data objects based on the importance tags and based on a peek view associated with a pull command, which is described, for example, at page 10, first full paragraph, (lines 10-23) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 210, 215, and 260, in Fig. 3, element 130, and in Fig. 4, elements 410 and 415;

means for copying the subset from a main view to the peek view, which is described, for example, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 9-11) of the specification and in Fig. 4, element 420; and

means for replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 18-23) of the specification, page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, page 14, first full paragraph (lines 7-12) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 215, and 220, and in Fig. 4, elements 435 and 445.

With reference to claim 8, in an embodiment, the means for selecting based on the peek view is further based on a size of the peek view, which is described, for example, at page 12, first full paragraph (lines 4-7) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, and in Fig. 4, element 415.

With reference to claim 11, an embodiment of the invention comprises a storage medium encoded with instructions, which is described, for example, at page 5, third full paragraph, (lines 22-25) of the specification, at page 8, second and third full paragraphs and the final partial paragraph (lines 17-28) of the specification, and in Fig. 1, element 115.

With further reference to claim 11, the instructions when executed comprise:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects in response to a pull command from a peek view, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view, which is described, for example, at page 12, last partial paragraph (lines 27-30) of the specification, at page 13, first partial paragraph and first full paragraph (lines 1-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, element 205, 210, 215, 220, and 260, and in Fig. 4, elements 410 and 415;

copying the subset to a peek view, which is described, for example, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 9-11) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 210, 215, and 220, and in Fig. 4, element 420; and

replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 18-23) of the specification, page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, page 14, first full paragraph (lines 7-12) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 215, and 220, and in Fig. 4, elements 435 and 445.

With reference to claim 12, the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a plurality of importance tags associated with the respective first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the respective importance tags specify a ranking of the first plurality of respective data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 15-16) of the specification, at page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, at page 12, first full paragraph (lines 1-14) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, element 205, in Fig. 3, elements 130 and 326, and in Fig. 4, elements 410 and 415.

With reference to claim 13, the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on the plurality of importance tags and a size of the peek view, which is described, for example, at page 12, first full paragraph (lines 4-7) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, and in Fig. 4, element 415.

With reference to claim 16, an embodiment of the invention comprises an electronic device, which is described, for example, at page 3, last partial paragraph (lines 24-27) of the specification and in Fig. 1, element 102;

a processor, which is described, for example, at page 4, first and second full paragraphs (lines 6-22) of the specification and in Fig. 1, element 110; and

a storage device encoded with instructions, which is described, for example, at page 4, last partial paragraph (lines 23-30) of the specification, at page 5, first partial paragraph, first full paragraph, second full paragraph, and third full paragraph (lines 1-29) of the specification, and in Fig. 1, elements 115 and 126.

With further reference to claim 16, the instructions when executed on the processor comprise:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects in response to a pull command from a peek view, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view, which is described, for example, at page 12, last partial paragraph (lines 27-30) of the specification, at page 13, first partial paragraph and first full paragraph (lines 1-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 210, 215, 220, and 260, and in Fig. 4, elements 410 and 415;

copying the subset to a peek view, which is described, for example, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 9-11) of the specification and in Fig. 4, element 420;

replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 18-23) of the specification, page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, page 14, first full paragraph (lines 7-12) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 205, 215, and 220, and in Fig. 4, element 445;

receiving an update to the first plurality of data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 18-23), at page 14, first partial paragraph (lines 1-6) of the specification, at Fig. 1, element 128, at Fig. 2, element 205, and at Fig. 4, elements 405, 435, and 440; and

modifying the subset in the peek view based on the update, which is described, for example, at page 10, first full paragraph (lines 13-14) in the specification, at page 14, first full paragraph (lines 7-13) of the specification, in Fig. 2, elements 210, 215, and 220, and at Fig. 4, elements 405, 435, 440, and 445.

With reference to claim 17, the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a plurality of importance tags associated with the respective first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the respective importance tags specify a ranking of the first plurality of respective data objects, which is described, for example, at page 3, last full paragraph (lines 15-16) of the specification, at page 10, first full paragraph (lines 10-23) of the specification, at page 12, first full paragraph (lines 1-14) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, in Fig. 2, element 205, in Fig. 3, elements 130 and 326, and in Fig. 4, elements 410 and 415.

With reference to claim 18, the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on the plurality of importance tags and a size of the peek view, which is described, for example, at page 12, first full paragraph (lines 4-7) of the specification, at page 13, first full paragraph (lines 4-9) of the specification, and in Fig. 4, element 415.

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 12

Docket: ROC920030263US1

6. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Whether claims 1-6 and 8-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gegner (WO 2003/104966 A3), hereinafter "Gegner."

7. Argument

A) The Applicable Law

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP § 2131.

The Examiner has the burden under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). To do that the Examiner must show that some objective teaching in the prior art or some knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead an individual to combine the relevant teaching of the references. *Id.*

The *Fine* court stated that:

Obviousness is tested by "what the combined teaching of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 878 (CCPA 1981). But it "cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination." *ACS Hosp. Sys.*, 732 F.2d at 1577, 221 USPQ at 933. And "teachings of references can be combined *only* if there is some suggestion or incentive to do so." *Id.* (emphasis in original).

The M.P.E.P. adopts this line of reasoning, stating that

In order for the Examiner to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three base criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation

of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *M.P.E.P.* § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)).

An invention can be obvious even though the suggestion to combine prior art teachings is not found in a specific reference. *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). At the same time, however, although it is not necessary that the cited references or prior art specifically suggest making the combination, there must be some teaching somewhere which provides the suggestion or motivation to combine prior art teachings and applies that combination to solve the same or similar problem which the claimed invention addresses. One of ordinary skill in the art will be presumed to know of any such teaching. (See, e.g., *In re Nilssen*, 851 F.2d 1401, 1403, 7 USPQ2d 1500, 1502 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1037, 202 USPQ 171, 174 (CCPA 1979)).

A factor cutting against a finding of motivation to combine or modify the prior art is when the prior art teaches away from the claimed combination. A reference may be said to teach away when a person of ordinary skill, upon reading the reference, would be discouraged from following the path set out in the reference, or would be led in a direction divergent from the path the applicant took. *In re Gurley*, 27 F.3d 551, 31 USPQ 2d 1130, 1131 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *United States v. Adams*, 383 U.S. 39, 52, 148 USPQ 479, 484 (1966); *In re Sponnoble*, 405 F.2d 578, 587, 160 USPQ 237, 244 (C.C.P.A. 1969); *In re Caldwell*, 319 F.2d 254, 256, 138 USPQ 243, 245 (C.C.P.A. 1963).

The test for obviousness under § 103 must take into consideration the invention as a whole; that is, one must consider the particular problem solved by the combination of elements that define the invention. *Interconnect Planning Corp. v. Feil*, 774 F.2d 1132, 1143, 227 USPQ 543, 551 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Furthermore, claims must be interpreted in light of the specification, claim language, other claims and prosecution history. *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1568, 1 USPQ2d 1593, 1597 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 481 U.S. 1052 (1987). At the same time, a prior patent cited as a § 103 reference must be considered in its entirety, "*i.e.* as a *whole*, including portions that lead away from the invention." *Id.* That is, the Examiner must, as one of the inquiries pertinent to any

obviousness inquiry under 35 U.S.C. § 103, recognize and consider not only the similarities but also the critical differences between the claimed invention and the prior art. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 834, 15 USPQ2d 1566, 1568 (Fed. Cir. 1990), *reh'g denied*, 1990 U.S. App. LEXIS 19971 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Finally, the Examiner must avoid hindsight. *Id.*

As explained in M.P.E.P. § 2112, the express, implicit, and inherent disclosures of a prior art reference may be relied upon in the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 or 103. But, the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further, "[i]n relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." *Ex parte Levy*, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original).

B) Discussion of the Rejections

1. Claims 1-6 and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gegner (WO 2003/104,966 A3).

Claims 1-6 and 8-20

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-6 and 8-20 are patentable over Gegner because all of the elements of claims 1-6 and 8-20 are not taught or suggested by Gegner for the reasons argued below.

Claim 1 recites: "selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects ...; copying the subset to a peek view; and replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects." Since claim 1 recites that the subset is copied from the first plurality of data objects and the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects, once the first plurality of data objects have been replaced, the subset in the peek view is different from the second plurality of data objects in the main view.

In contrast, in *Gegner*, the left-hand side of Fig. 5 (which the Examiner relies on for a peek view) is identical to a portion of the right-hand side of Fig. 5 (which the Office Action relies on for a main view). Thus, the right-hand side of Fig. 5 was not replaced by different data objects, so *Gegner* does not teach or suggest “replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects,” as recited in claim 1.

Claims 6, 11, and 16 include similar elements as argued above for claim 1 and are patentable over the references for similar reasons. Claims 2-5, 8-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are dependent on claims 1, 6, 11, and 16, respectively, and are patentable for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, and 18

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, and 18 are patentable over *Gegner* because all of the elements of claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 17, and 18 are not taught or suggested by *Gegner* for the reasons argued below.

Claim 1 recites “selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects based on a respective importance of each of the first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view; copying the subset to a peek view; and replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.”

Thus, in claim 1, the data objects that are copied to the peek view are selected based on the importance of the objects, and the entire first plurality of data objects remain in the main view until all are replaced with the second plurality of data objects. Hence, data objects are not selectively suppressed; instead, data objects are selectively copied to an additional (peek) view.

In contrast, *Gegner* suppresses the display of less important objects, as recited in *Gegner* at page 3, lines 12-16: “the objects are arranged within a fixed hierarchy so that when the display resource on the display screen is not sufficient, objects can be automatically

suppressed, that is, starting with the lowest hierarchical level. As a result of the automatic suppression of less important objects, the display resource thus made available ensures a clearer display.”

Hence, Gegner suppresses the display of objects based on importance while claim 1 copies objects to a peek view based on importance, so Gegner describes the opposite of claim 1, and thus Gegner teaches away from claim 1.

Claims 6, 12, and 17 include similar elements as argued above for claim 1 and are patentable over Gegner for similar reasons. Claims 2-5, 8-10, 13, and 18 are dependent on claims 1, 6, 12, and 17, respectively, and are patentable for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

Claims 3, 8, 13, and 18

Appellant respectfully submits that claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 are patentable over Gegner because all of the elements of claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 are not taught or suggested by Gegner for the reasons argued below.

Claim 3 recites: “wherein the selecting further comprises: selecting the subset based on a size of the peek view.” Claim 3 is dependent on claim 1, which recites: selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects ... , wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view; copying the subset to a peek view.” Thus, in claim 3, the data objects that are copied to the peek view are selected based on the size of the peek view into which the subset is copied.

The Examiner relies on Gegner, page 3, lines 27-29, which recites: “when a group of objects is reduced in such a manner that readability of all objects of this group is no longer ensured, less important objects of the group are automatically eliminated, so as to ensure optimum readability of the remaining objects combined in the group.” Thus, Gegner picks those objects to eliminate that are less important and Gegner performs this at a time when readability is no longer ensured. In contrast, claim 3 (and claim 1 on which claim 3 depends) does not eliminate objects. Instead, claim 3 selects a subset of objects based on the size of the peek view into which claim 1 copies the subset. Thus, the Gegner eliminating objects at a

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 18

Docket: ROC920030263US1

time when readability is not ensured does not teach or suggest selecting objects to copy to a peek view based on the size of the peek view, as recited in claim 3 and in claim 1, on which claim 3 depends.

Claims 8, 13, and 18 recite similar elements as argued above for claim 3 and are patentable over Gegner for similar reasons.

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 19

Docket: ROC920030263US1

Conclusion


Appellant respectfully requests reversal of the above rejections. If the Board is of the opinion that any rejected claim may be allowable in amended form, then appellant also respectfully requests a statement to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Branson, et al.
By their Representative,

Date September 26, 2007

By



Owen J. Gamon
Reg. No.: 36,143
phone: 651-645-7135
fax: 651-457-5622

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law
Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901

Certificate under 37 C.F.R. 1.8: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile (Fax no: 571-273-8300) to the Commissioner of Patents or is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner of Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on September 26, 2007.

Name Owen J. Gamon

Signature



8. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method comprising:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects based on a respective importance of each of the first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view;

copying the subset to a peek view; and

replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the selecting is in response to a pull command at the peek view.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the selecting further comprises:

selecting the subset based on a size of the peek view.

4. The method of claim 1, further comprising:

receiving an update to the plurality of data objects; and

modifying the subset in the peek view based on the update.

5. The method of claim 4, further comprising:

re-selecting the subset based on a change to the importance, wherein the receiving further receives the change to the importance.

6. An apparatus comprising:

means for receiving a first plurality of data objects and a plurality of respective importance tags;

means for selecting a subset of the first plurality of data objects based on the importance tags and based on a peek view associated with a pull command;

means for copying the subset from a main view to the peek view; and

means for replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.

8. The apparatus of claim 6, wherein the means for selecting based on the peek view is further based on a size of the peek view.

9. The apparatus of claim 6, further comprising:

means for copying the subset from the peek view to the main view in response to a push command associated with the peek view.

10. The apparatus of claim 6, further comprising:

means for receiving an update to the first plurality of data objects; and
means for modifying the subset in the peek view based on the update.

11. A storage medium encoded with instructions, wherein the instructions when executed comprise:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects in response to a pull command from a peek view, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view;
copying the subset to a peek view; and
replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects.

12. The storage medium of claim 11, wherein the selecting further comprises:

selecting the subset based on a plurality of importance tags associated with the respective first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the respective importance tags specify a ranking of the first plurality of respective data objects.

13. The storage medium of claim 12, wherein the selecting further comprises:

selecting the subset based on the plurality of importance tags and a size of the peek view.

14. The storage medium of claim 11, further comprising:

receiving an update to the first plurality of data objects; and
modifying the subset in the peek view based on the update.

15. The storage medium of claim 14, further comprising:

modifying the first plurality of data objects in the main view based on the update.

16. An electronic device comprising:

a processor; and

a storage device encoded with instructions, wherein the instructions when executed on the processor comprise:

selecting a subset of a first plurality of data objects in response to a pull command from a peek view, wherein the first plurality of data objects are displayed in a main view,

copying the subset to a peek view,

replacing the first plurality of data objects in the main view with a second plurality of data objects, wherein the second plurality of data objects are different from the first plurality of data objects,

receiving an update to the first plurality of data objects, and

modifying the subset in the peek view based on the update.

17. The electronic device of claim 16, wherein the selecting further comprises:

selecting the subset based on a plurality of importance tags associated with the respective first plurality of respective data objects, wherein the respective importance tags specify a ranking of the first plurality of respective data objects.

18. The electronic device of claim 17, wherein the selecting further comprises:

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 23

Docket: ROC920030263US1

selecting the subset based on the plurality of importance tags and a size of the peek view.

19. The electronic device of claim 16, wherein the instructions further comprise:

copying the subset back to the main view in response to a push command from the peek view.

20. The electronic device of claim 16, wherein the instructions further comprise:

sorting data in the subset in the peek view based on a sort rule associated with the data.

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al. Page 24
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003 Docket: ROC920030263US1
Title: Moving Data Between Views

9. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

Appellant: Michael J. Branson, et al.
Serial No.: 10/687,291
Filed: October 16, 2003
Title: Moving Data Between Views

Page 25

Docket: ROC920030263US1

10. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.